

Meeting:	Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel
Date:	17 September 2008
Subject:	Wealdstone controlled parking zone – Review, possible extension and associated restrictions - Objections to Traffic Orders.
Key Decision:	No
Responsible Officer:	Eddie Collier- Head of Property and Infrastructure
Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Susan Hall- Environment and Community Safety Portfolio Holder
Exempt:	No
Enclosures:	Appendix A – Geographical extent of proposals Appendix B – Grounds for objection and officer comments

SECTION 1 – SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report considers objections received to the traffic orders for the proposed extension of the Wealdstone controlled parking zone C and associated parking restrictions to zones C & CA and recommends the proposals should be implemented.

Recommendations (for decision by the Environment and Community Safety Portfolio Holder):

that the Panel recommends:

That the formal objections to the advertised traffic orders for the extension and revision to the Wealdstone Controlled Parking Zones C and CA incorporating a residents parking scheme and some associated waiting and loading restrictions be set aside for reasons given in the report, the objectors be informed and officers proceed with the order making and implementation.

REASON: As stated in Section 2.2 and **Appendix B** to the Officer Report.

SECTION 2 - REPORT

2.1.1 Background

- 2.1.2 The existing Wealdstone CPZs were initially introduced in 1996, and extended and split into the present zones C and CA in June 2003. The main zone CA review changes were implemented in April 2008. These included an extension of the CPZ and associated change to main road and junction parking restrictions.
- 2.1.3 The results of a second phase of consultation covering further localized parking issues in the zone CA study area were reported to this Panel in September 2007. The results of local consultation on a possible extension of Zone C, which lies to the southwest of the railway line, and associated parking restrictions, were also reported.
- 2.1.4 This Panel agreed the recommended changes including the extension of Zone C should be taken forward to the statutory consultation of traffic orders. The statutory consultation period ran from 3 to 23 July 2008. The traffic order changes were placed as advertisements in the London Gazette and Harrow Times. Street notices were posted in affected streets for display during the statutory consultation period. These summarized the general essence of the proposals as relevant to that location, advised where full details of the changes could be found and to whom observations and objections should be made.
- 2.1.5 This report describes the results of statutory consultation, including the advertisement of the draft traffic orders. It consists of formal objections received together with officer comments and recommendations as to how these objections should be addressed.
- 2.1.6 Traffic orders were advertised covering aspects described in 2.1.7 below for the area shown on the plan at **Appendix A**. Seven letters of objections have been received by the Traffic and Highway Network Manager. A summary of the objections are listed below:-
- (i) a letter from a resident of Walton Road relating to the proposed extension of zone C;
 - (ii) a letter from Marlborough School relating to the proposed extension of zone C.
 - (iii) a letter from a resident of Dobbin Close relating to proposed double yellow line restrictions in that road;
 - (iv) a letter from a resident living near the junction between Kenmore Avenue and Beaufort Avenue relating to proposed double yellow line restrictions at that junction;
 - (v) 3 letters from residents of Masons Avenue relating to proposed changed parking bay restrictions in that road;
- 2.1.7 The grounds for objection are summarized together with officer comments in **Appendix B**. More general background information for certain sections of the scheme are set out below to assist consideration of these objections.
- 2.1.8 The scheme proposals mainly comprised:-

- (i) An extension to the Wealdstone CPZ zone C to include Badminton Close, Leys Close, Rugby Close, Walton Close, Walton Road; the remaining section of Marlborough Hill, and part of Walton Drive.
- (ii) Echelon permit bays in a lay-bay at the northern end of Princes Drive;
- (iii) Main road and junction waiting restrictions, largely double yellow lines at or near junctions to improve visibility and/or access, including additional restrictions in Dobbin Close;
- (iv) New or revised loading restrictions on Headstone Lane and Harrow View;
- (v) One additional permit parking space and a new shared use bay on Masons Avenue. Revised or new waiting and loading restrictions on the approach to the traffic signals in that road and a new loading bay in The Bridge;
- (vi) Revision to the parking bays in Tudor Road;
- (vii) No stopping restriction outside Elmgrove First and Middle School, Kenmore Avenue;
- (viii) New pay and display bays on the north side of Milton Road. Revised waiting and loading restrictions on and adjacent to Station Road and Station Approach by Civic Centre;
- (ix) Revised eligibility for purchasing permits to allow business permits.

The area of the above proposals is shown at **Appendix A**.

2.2 Options considered

- 2.2.1 Having consideration for the scale and diversity of the scheme proposals it is surprising how few objections have been received. Approximately 2800 residential and business addresses were consulted on parking proposals which led to the proposed scheme.
- 2.2.2 Two objections were received to the extension of the controlled parking zone. However, one of these came from a first and middle school on behalf of its staff. This compares to the 88 responses received in the local consultation referred to in 2.2.1 where a clear majority of responses from streets within the scheme area supported the proposed extension. Having regard to the officer comments given in **Appendix B** and the support shown in consultation it is recommended that the objections be set aside and the CPZ be extended as advertised.
- 2.2.3 A letter and an email were received regarding the double yellow line proposals at separate locations in Dobbins Close and a junction on Kenmore Avenue. In the original consultation, twelve responses from Dobbin Close supported the additional double yellow lines whereas eight were against or had reservations. The extent of restrictions in the draft traffic order was reduced in an attempt to address concerns. The resident however still believes the restrictions are unnecessary and should be linked with issues apart from parking on the public highway. The other resident states their support of double yellow lines in principle but is concerned that their extent reduces parking opportunities. As outlined in **Appendix B** the restrictions are proposed to enable council enforcement at locations where the Highway Code states people should not park. The restrictions are to improve visibility which should reduce accident risk and access especially

for larger vehicles. Both locations were re-examined to confirm the need and required length. It is therefore recommended that these objections be set aside except for a reduction in length of one section of double yellow line in Dobbin Close as this does not compromise the access improvements.

- 2.2.4 Three letters from addresses in Masons Avenue all state they oppose the proposed plans to reduce permit parking places and replace them with parking places where people pay and display. Regrettably these objections have been based on a misunderstanding of the proposals which actually propose additional space available to permit holders. The proposal is for an additional dedicated permit holder space and four further spaces available to permit holders and to people who pay and display, see 2.1.7 (v) above. The residents have been advised their concerns are incorrect and sent a plan of the proposals in order to clarify what actually has been proposed. One resident has confirmed they do not wish to oppose what is proposed.

2.3 Consultation

- 2.3.1 Ward councillors were consulted throughout the review and were advised of the traffic orders being subject to statutory consultation.
- 2.3.2 All the scheme proposals which were advertised as part of the statutory consultation process were the subject of local consultation of people at approximately 2800 addresses during July 2006. The scheme proposals, especially the extent of the now proposed extension of zone C, are a result of the responses received. The analysis of the responses received and revised proposals were the subject of a report to this Panel on 25 September 2007.
- 2.3.3 The statutory consultation process, the results of which are the subject of this report, is carried out using legal processes described in section 2.5 below

2.4 Financial Implications

- 2.4.1 The estimated overall cost including implementation of the scheme which has been advertised is £95,000 of which £15,000 has already been spent this financial year
- 2.4.2 £95,000 is currently available from the Harrow Capital budget in 2008/09 to cover the implementation of this scheme.
- 2.4.3 The estimate of £95,000 includes an allowance of £9,000 for replacing the existing permit plates in the existing zone with ones that include the zone times as part of a programme of changes previously agreed.
- 2.4.4 The Capital programme for 2009/10 and 2010/11 includes £20,000 in each year for possible changes to parking on the periphery of the areas in line with the principles already established on Wealdstone CPZ of revisiting these areas approximately 6-12 months after implementation of the scheme in the main area.

2.5 Legal Implications

2.5.1 Controlled parking zones and associated waiting and loading restrictions can be implemented under Sections 6, 45, 46 and 49 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

2.6 Performance Issues

2.6.1 There are no Best Value performance indicators relating to CPZs.

2.6.2 Although no funding is provided by Transport for London, CPZs form part of the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy, West London Transport Strategy and are an integral part of the Council's LIP.

2.6.3 The provision of CPZs meets the following priorities in Mayor of London's LIP:

- Priority IV Improving the working of parking and loading arrangements
- Priority V Improving accessibility and social inclusion on the transport network

2.6.4 This proposal supports the Harrow Vision and Corporate Priorities as follows:

- Priority 1) Deliver cleaner streets, better environmental services and keep crime low
- Priority 5) Improve the way we work for our residents

2.7 Risk Management Implications

2.7.1 This project is not included on the Directorate risk register.

2.7.2 When approved for implementation, however, it will have its own generic risk register as part of the project management process.

2.8 Equalities Impact

2.8.1 The introduction of CPZs increases overall accessibility and social inclusion by the provision of additional parking for disabled people.

2.9 Community Safety (s17 Crime & Disorder Act 1998)

2.9.1 These recommended proposals will have a neutral impact on crime and disorder.

SECTION 3 - STATUTORY OFFICER CLEARANCE

Chief Finance Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Sheela Thakrar
		Date: ...1/9/2008.....
Legal & Monitoring Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Rachel Jones
		Date:5/9/2008.....

SECTION 4 - PERFORMANCE OFFICER CLEARANCE

Performance Officer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Name: ...Tom Whiting
Date:3/9/2008.....		

SECTION 5 - CONTACT DETAILS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS

Contact: Stephen Freeman,
Traffic Engineer, Traffic Management
Tel. No: 020 8424 1437

Background Papers:

- 1 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 25 September 2007
Agenda Item 13 - Wealdstone controlled parking zone –
Review, possible extension and associated restrictions Zone
C and Zone CA Phase 2 Consultation results.
- 2 Traffic and Road Safety Advisory Panel 26 February 2008
Agenda Item 9 – Controlled parking zone/parking schemes -
Annual review.
- 3 Traffic Order
- 4 A0 plans of detailed scheme parking restriction changes.

IF APPROPRIATE, does the report include the following considerations?

1.	Consultation	YES/ NO
2.	Corporate Priorities	YES / NO